

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 24-30 are now pending. Non-elected claims 1, 4, and 6-23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Dependent claims 24-30 have been added.

The title of the invention has been amended to read --VIDEO DECODING METHOD PERFORMING SELECTIVE ERROR CONCEALMENT AND RESYNCHRONIZATION-- to be more clearly indicative of aspects of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement dated January 22, 2001.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Matsumura et al. (U.S. Patent 5,835,144). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Matsumura. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 2 is directed to a video decoding method for decoding a coded video stream. The video decoding method of claim 2 receives a coded video stream, together with an error detection result indicating whether an error is contained in a coded stream in each packet. The coded video stream is composed of plural pieces of compressed block coded data, which are composed of plural kinds of data elements. Data elements of the same kind are arranged in succession over plural blocks, and the coded video stream is divided, at the point of change and the kind of data elements arranged in succession, into each packet. Each packet is provided with an error detecting code for obtaining an error detection result. Claim 2 specifies that:

upon detecting a decoding error...the position of said decoding error in said coded video stream is decided based on an error detection result received and error concealment is selectively performed based on said decided position of said decoding error.

In alleging that Matsumura anticipates independent claim 1, the Office Action cites column 9, lines 45-49, which states:

If an error occurred in variable-length decoding, the source decoder 15 replaces entire macroblocks from the point of the error up to the resynchronization point with the equivalent macroblocks from the previous frame in the moving-picture sequence.

Although this citation supports the conclusion that the video decoding apparatus of Matsumura performs error correction, Applicants respectfully submit that this disclosure in Matsumura fails to teach or suggest the decoding technique of claim 2, in which error concealment is selectively performed based on the decided position of the decoding error.

According to MPEP § 2131, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claims.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsumura fails to anticipate independent claim 2.

Dependent claim 3 specifies that the plural kinds of data elements (of the compressed block coded data) contain a data stream composed of motion vectors and a data stream composed of pieces of texture information. Claim 3 further specifies that:

based on said error detection result received together with each data stream and the position of said decoding error detected in the decoding of said each data stream, it is decided whether to perform error concealment using decoded motion vectors or abandon said motion vectors and said texture data and perform error concealment.

Applicants respectfully submit that Matsumura fails to teach or suggest this claim element. Furthermore, because the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 fails to cite prior art, or knowledge generally available to those who are skilled in the art, that teaches this feature, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness of claim 3.

Independent claim 5 is directed to a video decoding method that receives a coded video stream together with an error detection result indicating whether an error is contained in a coded stream in each packet. Claim 5 specifies that the coded video stream is composed of plural pieces of compressed block data and coded header information contains a unique code indicating the head of each block coded data and its block number. The coded video stream is divided into packets at a point of change between the header information and the block coded data, and the packets are provided with an error detecting code for obtaining an error detection result.

Independent claim 5 specifies that:

upon detecting a decoding error during decoding of said coded video stream received for each packet, the position of resynchronization is decided based on said unique code and said error detection result received together with coded data of said header information and resynchronization is performed from the bit position of error detection to a unique code indicating the beginning of the next block coded data.

In alleging that Matsumura anticipates claim 5, the Office Action cites column 8, line 40 – column 9, line 50. Although this cited portion of Matsumura supports the conclusion that the

video decoder described therein performs resynchronization, Applicants note that Matsumura utilizes a self-resynchronizing variable-length code. See e.g., column 7, lines 42-56. Consequently, the video decoding apparatus of Matsumura does not perform resynchronization in the manner recited in claim 5.

At least for this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsumura fails to anticipate claim 5.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's prior art rejections based on Matsumura.

New Claims

New claims 24-30 are dependent claims, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 2. Applicants respectfully submit that the features of these dependent claims are clearly supported by aspects of the first disclosed embodiment, described at pages 19-28 of the specification.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional

Application No. 09/692,720
Amendment dated September 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 24, 2005

Docket No.: 1163-0299P

fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant